DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 743 IR 050 110

AUTHOR Boucher, Virginia; And Others
TITLE Resource Sharing at the University Libraries, University of Colorado, Boulder. A Report of the Resource Sharing Task Force.
INSTITUTION Colorado Univ., Boulder. Libraries.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cataloging; College Libraries; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Acquisition; Library Collections; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; National Libraries; Online Systems; Research Libraries; *Shared Services
IDENTIFIERS Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries; Library of Congress; OCLC; *University of Colorado Boulder

ABSTRACT

One of five working groups established as part of a collection analysis project at the University of Colorado, Boulder (UCB), the Task Force on Resource Sharing was organized in order to determine the University Libraries' current purpose and practice in resource sharing and to recommend directions for the future. Their report is presented in three parts: Collections, Resource Sharing (including Bibliographic Access, Cooperative Arrangements, and Document Delivery), and the National Scene and Future Developments. Each section includes a description, an evaluation, and recommendations. Topics covered include the effects of decreased funding for acquisitions; UCB involvement in cooperative collection development programs at the state and national levels, especially the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL); an examination of bibliographic access systems, e.g., the CARL Union List of Serials, the Colorado Union Catalog (CUC), and services from OCLC, the Library of Congress (LC), the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), and the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN); document delivery by courier, the U.S. Postal Service, and United Parcel Service; national resource sharing concerns; and both national and local resource sharing development projects. Seven conclusions are listed, and a 48-item bibliography is provided. (ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226743

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

University Libraries

IR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RESOURCE SHARING AT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

A Report of the Resource Sharing Task Force

submitted to the

Collection Analysis Project Study Team

by

Virginia Boucher

Eddy Hogan

Susan G. McCann

Steven D. Wrede

October 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

v. Boucher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR050110

Campus Box 184 • Boulder, Colorado 80309

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
COLLECTION	4
RESOURCE SHARING: BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS	10
RESOURCE SHARING: COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	19
RESOURCE SHARING: DOCUMENT DELIVERY	38
NATIONAL SCENE AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS	41
CONCLUSION	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	46

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1981, at the University of Colorado, Boulder (UCB), the University Libraries elected to undertake a Collection Analysis Project in accordance with the model developed by the Office of Management Studies of the Association of Research Libraries. A Study Team was organized with the charge to review and evaluate current collection management practices and to make recommendations leading to a rational collection program. The Study Team issued its interim report in February 1982. At this time, five separate Task Forces were established to collect data and to make recommendations for the final report.

The Task Force on Resource Sharing was organized in order to determine the University Libraries' current purpose and practice in resource sharing and to recommend directions for the future. Three specific charges were made to the Task Force:

(1) To describe and analyze the resource sharing activities of the University Libraries. To consider the major strengths and weaknesses in the current programs, the impact on user access to materials, and the impact on the Libraries' collection development program.

(2) To describe and analyze developing resource sharing activities.

(3) To make recommendations for future activities including necessary changes.

For its project the Task Force adopted the following working definition of resource sharing:

> the use of such services as library materials, computer services, data files, storage capacity, and personnel by a number of members of a network; the primary purpose of

> resource sharing is to improve access of library users to the materials or information they require.[1]

Since only one member of the Task Force had extensive experience in resource sharing, the project began with a review of the literature and background reading. Individual members reported on their readings to the group. Resource sharing trends, activities, and technologies were discussed and inventoried by the group.

In defining and analyzing the resource sharing activities available, the Task Force made extensive use of the "Inventory of Resource Sharing Activities" and the "Cost/Benefits of Resource Sharing Programs" charts from The Collection Analysis Project: An Assisted Self-Study Manual.[2] The inventory charts drawn up by the Task Force fell into four groups according to the scope of the activities: local, state, regional, and national. With a comprehensive listing of activities, the Task Force gathered and analyzed data. Then recommendations were made for resource sharing at UCB. In gathering data, the Task Force benefited from having as its chairperson an individual with membership in several regional and national resource sharing organizations. Much information was gathered from reports made within the University Libraries, from administrative files, from informal meetings with personnel in various departments, and from formal interviews. The interviews were held with Clyde Walton (Director of the University Libraries), Lynne Foote of the Colorado Technical Reference Center, JoAn Segal of the Bibliographical Center for Research, and Allison Walth formerly interlibrary loan librarian at the Three Rivers Library System and currently in cataloging at UCB.

1. Virginia Boucher, Colorado Library Network Plan (Denver, Colo.: Colorado State Library, 1977), p. 53.

2. Jeffrey G. Gardner and Duane E. Webster, The Collection Analysis Project: An Assisted Self-Study Manual (Washington, D.C.: Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries, 1980), p. 10-23, 10-24.

This data allowed the Task Force to estimate the costs of certain resource sharing activities and to ascertain the current and possible benefits of the activities.

In making recommendations, the Task Force took the viewpoint of the library user who is trying to obtain needed materials and took into account the possible impact on the University Libraries' collection development program. In addition, the Task Force considered the tentative nature of several of the projects currently involving UCB and the current trends in funding for the University Libraries.

This report is organized into three sections: Collections, Resource Sharing, and National Scene and Future Developments. The format of each section includes description, evaluation, and recommendations. A bibliography is included. In addition to being used for collection analysis purposes, the Task Force hopes this report can be used to inform the faculty and staff of the University Libraries about current resource sharing activities at UCB.

THE COLLECTION

Description

The nation-wide library problem of decreasing funding and increasing per title cost for new acquisitions has been especially difficult for the University Libraries. The recent increases in acquisition monies have been long-fought political battles and still do not allow for the purchase of multiple copies for many titles. Despite this unfavorable climate, the collection at UCB remains the largest, and among the heaviest used, in the state. The University's relatively long history, the large number of graduate programs offered, the support within the University Libraries for undergraduate education, and the particularly strong serial holdings have helped to create a library collection that is a regional resource. This collection is available for use to all who enter the buildings. Circulation privileges are granted to all Colorado residents over the age of 18 as well as to all members of the academic community.

As in all aspects of the Rocky Mountain West, geography has played a major role in the development of the University Libraries' collection. The long distance to other large libraries does not allow UCB to readily use other collections to supplement its own, as can be done in more urban and heavily populated regions. Most libraries in the surrounding states have collections comparable to those at UCB, and these cannot be used extensively to fill in any gaps. The need for a significant degree of independence has prompted the University Libraries to support the teaching and research of the University community as strongly as available funds would allow.

To assist in collection development at UCB, Interlibrary Loan provides information on the items borrowed for University users. Each

year a report is provided on the periodical titles from which more than five requests for articles were made. From this report, requests for periodical subscriptions can be submitted and justified. Interlibrary Loan provides each bibliographer with a copy of the OCLC bibliographic record for requested materials that have a publication date within the last two years. Interlibrary Loan completes statistics on the titles requested from the Health Sciences Library, University of Colorado, located 30 miles from the UCB campus in Denver. Collection policy generally does not allow for much duplication of titles between UCB and the Health Sciences Library. The borrowing statistics from Interlibrary Loan help justify some variance from this policy.

UCB is also involved in cooperative collection development programs at the state and national levels. In the state, UCB belongs to the Colorado Organization for Library Acquisitions (COLA), a part of the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL). CARL is a group of the largest libraries in Colorado which have banded together to develop and operate mutually beneficial cooperative library programs. This voluntary alliance is composed of Auraria Libraries (which includes the University of Colorado, Denver), the Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, Denver Public Library, the University of Colorado, Boulder, the University of Denver, and the University of Northern Colorado. COLA, one of CARL's cooperative projects, considers and purchases monographic titles of research value costing $500 or more. The total COLA budget for the last fiscal year was $55,000, with UCB contributing $10,217. The remaining member libraries also contribute to the total budget. The joint purchases by COLA eliminate the need to purchase copies of very expensive titles at each member library when the availability of one copy for all to use is adequate. Materials purchased by COLA are housed at the

most appropriate member library and are available to all COLA members through interlibrary loan. Recent purchases by COLA include: Dictionary Catalog of the Art and Architecture Division New York Public Library housed at Denver Public Library, Current National Statistics Compendium housed at University of Denver, and The Manhattan Project Official History and Documents housed at Auraria. Both the Director of the Libraries and the Associate Director at UCB sit on the COLA committee.

The membership of UCB in the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) also supplements the University Libraries' collection. CRL is a non-profit organization operated and maintained by its member institutions for the purpose of increasing the library materials available to their readers for research. Founded in 1949, the Center is an international organization with over 180 members and associate members and a collection of over three million volumes. This collection includes a very large collection of the publications of over 100 foreign governments, current subscriptions to approximately 14,000 serial titles, and special collections and projects such as the Cooperative Africana Microform Project. CRL also provides access to journal articles through the British Library Lending Division. Membership in CRL for the 1982-83 fiscal year cost the University $14,524. The Director of the Libraries attends the annual membership meeting of CRL and frequently serves on a CRL committee.

Another aspect of collection development at UCB is the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan recently issued by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). The Master Plan makes two major recommendations: that all academic libraries in the state produce a collection development policy by 1985, to be filed at the State Library; and that the cooperative acquisition activities of COLA be expanded to include other public and private academic institutions in the state.

Through the membership of the Director of Libraries, UCB has direct involvement in the Collection Development Committee of the Colorado Council for Library Development, an advisory group for the Colorado State Library. This Collection Development Committee works toward encouraging collection policies for all libraries, assessing budgetary constraints, and determining collection intensity levels according to the type of library and the amount of money spent.

There currently is no exchange program for UCB. Because of the lack of University publications which can be used for exchange purposes, no additions to the UCB collection are obtained through exchange with other institutions.

Evaluation

Although it remains the largest library collection in the state, the slow-down in new acquisitions at UCB has negatively effected the ability of the University Libraries to meet the needs of its users. Especially significant is the policy of not purchasing multiple copies of titles. When considering the policy that Interlibrary Loan will not borrow materials that the University Libraries own, students are seriously hampered in their ability to get the materials they need, when they need them. With the current constraints on new acquisitions at UCB, it is extremely important that decisions as to what to purchase for the collection carefully match the needs of the primary clientele. Information from Interlibrary Loan on the materials borrowed provides important data for future acquisition decisions for both bibliographers and administrators.

Because of the nature of their work, the impact of the Colorado Council for Library Development and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education on the UCB Libraries' collection development is difficult to

evaluate at this time. The CCHE, Colorado Academic Library Master Plan has been released recently, and no one has had time to act upon the general recommendations made in the report. The Task Force could not determine any direct impact on the UCB collection from the Colorado Council for Library Development.

COLA is viewed as a useful and timely means to provide new additions to the UCB collection, without the necessity of directly purchasing and housing each acquisition. With the current budget, UCB could not individually purchase all the titles available to its users through COLA. Suggestions for titles to be considered for puchase through COLA are sought from UCB library faculty, but many faculty members feel that requests for suggestions are given on very short notice. Because of this short notice, many feel they cannot give adequate consideration to possible COLA purchases.

Membership in CRL assures access to a great amount and variety of research materials, and the CRL collections are an important aspect of our own collection. Most of the materials lent by CRL for University users would not be available through other sources, or would be available only at considerably more cost to the user.

Recommendations

1. Interlibrary Loan at UCB should continue to maintain statistics and to produce reports on the materials it borrows for the University community.
2. The Colorado Organization for Library Acquisitions should be strongly supported, and a more systematic approach should be adopted for obtaining suggestions for COLA purchases from the library faculty.
3. Membership in the Center for Research Libraries should continue in

order to augment UCB's own collection.

4. UCB should continue its involvement in and awareness of the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan and the appropriate committee of the Colorado Council for Library Development. Both entities are seen as positive forces for helping to build stronger collections for all library users.

RESOURCE SHARING: BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS

Resource sharing can take place when the item to be shared is described in careful detail and when the whereabouts of that item is known. Therefore, it is necessary to have access to library cataloging, which describes library materials in an accepted manner, and to union catalogs, which indicate which library has a particular item in its collection. The following section discusses what bibliographic access is available to the University Libraries.

Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries

Description

The Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) is a not-for-profit corporation whose governing board of three is elected from the seven libraries which compose the membership. All important decisions, however, take a vote of 5 to pass. CARL is served by an executive director based at Denver Public Library and appropriate staff. CARL is funded by member contributions, cost recovery for equipment and services, and grant money. The membership amount for 1981-1982 was $8,750 for UCB.

One of the early projects was to produce the CARL Union List of Serials which has since gone through a number of editions. The 1981 list, available on microfiche, includes serial holdings of CARL with the exception of Auraria Library. The Health Sciences Library, University of Colorado, not a CARL member, has added its holdings. Though the cataloging is not altogether uniform, the CARL Union List of Serials provides an easy-to-use access tool for CARL and for other libraries who wish to purchase it. With other projects demanding attention, there are no plans at this time to issue a new edition of the CARL Union List of Serials.

An exciting development for CARL is the online public access catalog. The purpose of this project is to provide online patron access to the catalogs of the seven research libraries and to replace the card catalogs with a computer system and terminals. At this stage, the Tandem computers have been installed in the computer room at Denver Public Library. The terminals will soon be going into the various libraries for a testing phase to determine the efficiency and adequacy of the system. Full operation will come at some future date. In addition to CARL funding, $166,000 has been received for this project from Library Service and Construction Act money.

In conjuction with the public access catalog, UCB, Colorado State University, and the University of Northern Colorado are working with DataPhase to install a new circulation system. This online system will provide up-to-date information for all its users on the status of library materials without the delays which are experienced today.

A number of CARL committees, composed of appropriate staff from each member institution, are working on the development of the CARL projects. The CARL Circulation Committee is busily engaged in cooperative planning for circulation. The Online Catalog Transition Committee is concerned with public information about the projects and training of patrons to use the public access catalog. The Online Public Access Catalog Committee works with technical specifications.

Evaluation

While the projects have not yet come to full flower, CARL remains the single most important resource sharing involvement for UCB. The CARL Union List of Serials is used many times each day. With the aid of the online public access catalog and the new circulation system, full use should be made of the CARL collections. The obstacles to be over-

come and the problems to be solved cannot all be foreseen at present. Change will occur in how both library users and library staff perform library functions. As a true cooperative project, patience and perseverance will continue to be required.

Recommendations

1. The DataPhase circulation system must be implemented with all speed.
2. The online public access catalog should be strongly supported as being the most effective resource sharing tool for the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries.
3. One person should be designated to coordinate all automation projects for the University Libraries.

Colorado Union Catalog

Description

The Colorado Union Catalog (CUC), begun in 1978, is designed to make the holdings of Colorado libraries accessible to the people in the state. More than 80 academic, public, school, and special libraries have contributed information about monographs, government publications, and serials to the CUC. The 4th edition, due to be published on microfiche and distributed in October 1982, should contain about 1.2 million distinct titles. The CUC offers an author, title, and subject approach to the bibliographic information. Holdings statements are attached to the records. Libraries of all sizes find the information in the CUC valuable for verifying bibliographic citations and for interlibrary loan purposes. Funding for the last 4 years (1979-82), totalling $735,000, came from Library Services and Construction Act money. It is estimated that $100,000 to $150,000 are needed each year to produce the catalog. A request for funding to continue the CUC has been introduced as a line item in the Colorado State Library budget for 1983-84.

Evaluation

The National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1980, states that a library must exhaust local and state resources before making a request to an out-of-state library. Checking the CUC is an important part of the process of determining where an item is located in Colorado. The CUC is particularly valuable to small libraries which do not have other reference tools. For UCB, it is a help in finding materials in some of the public and special libraries whose bibliographic information is not easily found elsewhere.

Recommendation

A permanent source of funding should be found to continue the Colorado Union Catalog in order to allow all kinds of libraries in Colorado adequate bibliographic access to Colorado's library collections.

Colorado Union List of Serials

Description

In addition to the CARL Union List of Serials, there are a number of other union lists within the state as well as some serials information in the Colorado Union Catalog. There is no one place to look to find which library holds a particular title and volume. A comprehensive "Colorado Union List of Serials" has been a topic for discussion for a number of years, but no effort to begin such a project has met with success.

Evaluation

The proliferation of serials sources makes adequate bibliographic checking for interlibrary loan purposes very time consuming. A comprehensive "Colorado Union List of Serials" would save CARL the trouble and expense of having to produce another edition of the CARL Union List of Serials. A comprehensive list would presumably include the holdings of the Auraria Library and the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs.

Such a list would also make information about serials holdings more readily available to smaller libraries within the state. The cost of such a project is more than any funding source is willing to provide at present.

Recommendations

1. Backing should be sought to produce a comprehensive "Colorado Union List of Serials."
2. The serials union listing capability of the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) should be used in developing a Colorado list.

Online Computer Library Center

Description

The Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) is a not-for-profit computer library service and research organization based in Dublin, Ohio. OCLC operates an international network that libraries use to acquire and catalog library materials, order custom-printed catalog cards, arrange interlibrary lending, and maintain location information on library materials. The OCLC online union catalog contains 7,594,327 records (as of April 26, 1982).

Cataloging of Roman alphabet library materials at UCB is done using the capabilities of OCLC. The use of OCLC's cataloging subsystem puts UCB's records into the OCLC online union catalog or attaches a holding symbol to an already existing record thus making information about the recent acquisitions for the collection available to the more than 2,000 OCLC users located throughout the United States. These users include, among others, the CARL libraries, the other campuses of the University of Colorado, and the libraries of the Mid-America State Universities Association. The online union catalog contains records for audiovisuals, maps, manuscripts, sound recordings, and music scores

as well as monographs and serials. Catalog cards are produced as a result of using OCLC as well as machine-readable tapes which can be used as a basis for other projects such as the CARL online public access catalog.

Retrospective conversion of library records developed before use of OCLC began can be done using the cataloging subsystem. UCB is currently involved in restrospective conversion and must do much more in order to produce records for use in the CARL online public access catalog and the DataPhase circulation system. Some Library Services and Construction Act money, $16,000, has been received for retrospective conversion.

Other services available through OCLC include the interlibrary loan subsystem, which will be discussed later, the Name Address Directory, and the serials union listing capability. An acquisitions subsystem and a serials check-in subsystem are available but not used by UCB. The budgeted amount for all OCLC costs for UCB during 1982-83 is $70,000.

Evaluation

As a means of bibliographic access to cataloging information and statements of library holdings, OCLC has been accepted as a powerful tool for UCB and many other libraries in the United States. The libraries important to UCB all participate in OCLC. Due to a recent change in policy, many members of the Research Libraries Group, including Colorado State University, are now participating in OCLC by adding their cataloging. The Library of Congress is adding holdings statements to serial records instead of putting them into New Serials Titles. The Universal Serials and Book Exchange has entered its most important holdings into OCLC. Though the services offered by OCLC are not without considerable cost, it would be hard to imagine resource sharing without them.

Recommendations

1. UCB should continue to use OCLC as it has in the past. Retrospective conversion should be increased as an aid to the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries online public access catalog and the DataPhase circulation system.
2. All new UCB library staff should be given some basic instruction in the purpose and use of OCLC.

The Library of Congress

Description

The Library of Congress (LC) plays a vital role in the area of bibliographic access. The most important service LC provides to libraries throughout the United States is cataloging data. Printed cards, book catalogs, cataloging aids, and MARC records are all a part of this service. Nearly half of the catalog entries in the OCLC online union catalog were created by LC. But current online systems, such as OCLC, do not entirely do away with the need to search such time-honored tools as the National Union Catalog, the Register of Additional Locations, and New Serials Titles, all published by LC. Cataloging for publications in non-Roman alphabets is provided by LC which is also a leader in authority control work. All of these activities help to provide structure and standardization for the bibliographic labyrinth.

Evaluation

The Library of Congress provides to libraries in the United States many essential publications and services which help make resource sharing possible. Lack of sufficient funding may hamper the leadership role of the Library of Congress in the future.

Recommendation

Support must be continued for resource sharing activities at the Library

of Congress.

Center for Research Libraries

Description

Bibliographic access to the vast resources of the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) is far from adequate, although steps are being taken to correct the situation. The Handbook describes the collections in general terms and urges members to ask for anything within the scope of the various collections. The Catalogues for monographs, serials, and newspapers describe only a portion of the collections. A new microfiche edition of the Catalogue: Monographs and supplements will be forthcoming in the fall of 1982 with annual cumulative supplements planned for the future.

CRL is beginning to use OCLC. New acquisitions are now being cataloged on OCLC. Some older acquisitions will be added as backlogs are addressed. No retrospective conversion has been attempted yet, but in early 1983 current serials as well as U.S. newspapers will be added to OCLC.

Evaluation

As complete bibliographic control as is practical for so large and diverse a collection of materials is needed.

Recommendation

Continued expansion of bibliographic control for the Center for Research Libraries' collections should be encouraged by UCB at every opportunity.

Research Libraries Information Network

Description

The Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), formed from the BALLOTS bibliographic-data system of Stanford University, is the bibliographic utility of the Research Libraries Group. RLIN has an impressive

bibliographic data base which was built with research libraries in mind. Besides the bibliographic access offered by RLIN, the holdings of the members of the Research Libraries Group are displayed there and are not always available elsewhere. For example, it is very difficult to determine as a non-member what such an important research library as Yale University is cataloging these days. UCB is not a member of the Research Libraries Group. Colorado State University is a member of the Research Libraries Group and thus of RLIN but is taking advantage of the change in OCLC policy to become a participant in that organization as well.

A "search only" capability is offered to libraries which are not members of the Research Libraries Group. The start up cost for this service is $200, and system use is $45 per hour with $13.30 per hour for telecommunications. A minimum of two hours must be used each month.

Evaluation

The advantages of a "search only" capability for RLIN would be access to cataloging data of research materials and holdings statements for some large research libraries. With the change in OCLC policy, a number of Research Libraries Group members are putting their holdings into OCLC. Colorado State University plans to do this. That leaves a small number of large research libraries whose holdings will not be known to UCB. Though information about these holdings would be useful, the "search only" capability for RLIN, under the circumstances, is deemed too expensive for UCB.

Recommendation

At the present price, UCB should not acquire a "search only" capability for the Research Libraries Information Network.

RESOURCE SHARING: COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

Interlibrary Loan Service

Description

Simply stated, the goals for interlibrary loan are:

> To provide library materials not available in the collections of the University Libraries to members of the University community and to provide materials requested from the University Libraries to other libraries in Colorado and elsewhere.

Borrowing

A wide variety of materials is obtained through interlibrary loan, ranging from the latest book on plant taxonomy to an early edition of Chaucer's works. Any library material which circulates at another library may be requested on interlibrary loan, and photocopies of non-circulating materials may be requested. The Center for Research Libraries' collections are an important resource for interlibrary loans. Free photocopy is provided by arrangement with the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) and the Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA) libraries. Medical requests are sent to the University of Colorado Health Sciences Library in Denver for entry into the Regional Medical Library Program. Charges for photocopy are passed on to the library user while charges for borrowing materials are borne by UCB. The copyright law is carefully observed. Information is given regarding reciprocal borrowing in Colorado and concerning the use of other libraries in the state and country. The service is available to faculty, students, and staff of UCB. In 1981-82, 7,825 requests were processed.

In accordance with the various interlibrary loan codes, verification of bibliographic information is done for each request using a variety of reference tools including the OCLC online union catalog and the National Union Catalog. Location of libraries owning materials is gleaned from a

number of sources, especially OCLC, depending upon the type of material requested. Requests to borrow are transmitted by mail, courier, and electronic means (OCLC interlibrary loan subsystem, OnTyme-II, OCTANET for medical requests, and computer terminal transmission to the Center for Research Libraries). Occasionally, requests are made by telephone. Material arrives by U.S. Postal Service, courier, or United Parcel Service.

Those who use the service are an impatient, demanding clientele who want everything "as soon as possible" and who do not want to spend their own money. They are persistent.

Looking at the service from the perspective of the library user, some facts show, at least partially, the reason for the impatience.

Processing backlogs are counted on the first day of each month. No more than 50 to 75 borrowing requests should be needing attention by staff on a given day. No more than 80 to 100 lending requests should be needing attention by staff on a given day. As can be seen, backlogs for borrowing, in particular, greatly exceed what should be expected.

Interlibrary Loan Monthly Processing Backlogs 1981/82

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Borrowing	100	118	150	93	217	182	188	333	373	184	310	246
Lending	86	60	13	29	89	192	94	120	237	116	98	59
Total	186	178	163	122	306	374	282	453	610	300	408	305

Collections at the Health Sciences Library and UCB are generally not duplicated. A study of turnaround time (from the typing of the form until the photocopy was checked in at UCB) was done for 352 photocopy requests sent from January through July 1982 to the Health Sciences Library. The turnaround time was 6.7 days, to which must be added

initial processing time at UCB before the requests were transmitted. The library user must wait 7 or 8 days for a request to come from the Health Sciences Library which is only 30 miles distant.

In addition, during 1981-82, 180 requests were returned to library users because the material could not be supplied by the person's "Need Before" date. The staff for borrowing consists of a Library Technician, a Library Assistant II, a Library Assistant I (1/2 time), and about 50 hours of student time per week. The librarian who heads the department is involved in supervision, administration, and problem solving. Another librarian (1/2 time) assists with verification of bibliographic information and finding locations from which to borrow. Despite heavy use, there is a feeling among interlibrary loan staff that the services offered are not well enough known, particularly to graduate students. There is also a feeling that not all of the University Libraries' staff are knowledgeable about the services offered by interlibrary loan.

Lending

As the largest library in the state and the library with the strongest serials collection, heavy demands are made upon interlibrary lending. The lending service is offered to other libraries which abide by the various interlibrary loan codes. These libraries must be publicly supported or not-for-profit institutions. (The Colorado Technical Reference Center - which is not directed by the University Libraries - serves the for-profit institutions in North America). Materials which circulate from the collections are available on loan, and photocopy is done for non-circulating materials. Free photocopy is provided for up to 30 pages per request for Colorado, CARL, and MASUA libraries. Suitable charges are made for other photocopy, but no charge is made for loaning material. In 1981-82, 14,931 requests were processed.

Requests are received by the U.S. Postal Service, courier, OnTyme-II, and computer terminal communication with the regional library service systems in Colorado. Requests also come on the OCLC interlibrary loan subsystem. Occasionally one comes over the telephone. Materials from the main library, Norlin, and the six branch libraries are retrieved by student assistants who also do the photocopying in the branches. Campus Coin Copies does the photocopy of Norlin materials. Invoicing and cash deposits are done. Materials are sent by courier, mail, or United Parcel Service. Money is earned by being a net lender in Colorado under the Payment for Lending program. The amounts received through this program are below:

Colorado Payment for Lending Program

1976/77	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82
$7,210	$11,456	$10,786	$11,924	$9,751	$11,536

In-house turnaround time is of great concern. The CARL agreement specifies 24 hours; the Payment for Lending rules, 3 days; and OCLC, 4 days. Backlogs cause serious delays in service. Verbal complaints have been made by Colorado libraries about slow service, some of which can be attributed to the U.S. Postal Service.

The staff consists of a lending supervisor (Library Assistant II), and about 60 hours of student time per week. The Library Technician and the head of the department give supervision and problem solving assistance. A study in the spring of 1982 showed the following cost for interlibrary lending transactions:

Filled	$6.45	+65% overhead	$10.58
Unfilled	$3.39	+65% overhead	$ 5.56

Evaluation

While the Interlibrary Loan Service has a tradition of competent

delivery of service and of administrative support, library users may not be completely satisfied with the provision of resources from other libraries. Quick access to medical literature is needed by many in related and interdisciplinary fields. Although CARL libraries are helpful, libraries, markedly stronger than UCB, are located 1,000 miles in each direction which makes for slow document delivery. The complexity of conducting an interlibrary loan service has increased enormously with the variety of computer-based systems used as well as the traditional techniques which still must be used for a significant number of requests. Staff turnover has increased at the same time that training has become more complex. Administrative requirements necessitated by the need for accountability have taken time away from helping the library user. The workload has grown dramatically in the last 15 years. Lending activities, which are not provided for by the Colorado State Legislature in the University budget, are not adequately funded out of other state resources. And there is no data telling what the lending to other libraries does to the campus library user.

Recommendations

1. Full use should be made of UCB's own collections.
   a. The volunteer Book Finders program should be continued.
   b. Recalls, traces, prompt shelving, and continuous shelf reading should continue in a timely fashion.
   c. "Demand" rush purchases should be given priority.
   d. There should be a library ombudsman for locating materials in processing and seeing that a library user actually gets her or her "rush" request.
2. The University community should be made more aware of the Interlibrary Loan Service.

a. Articles should appear each year in the Colorado Daily and the Silver and Gold.

b. An interlibrary loan exhibit should be mounted in Norlin Library once each year.

c. Training on the use of the Center for Research Libraries should be done for new library faculty with a yearly up-date for public service staff and bibliographers.

d. A yearly up-date on resource sharing should be presented to public service staff and bibliographers.

e. Resource sharing information should be given routinely to new University Libraries' employees during library-wide orientation.

3. The effectiveness of interlibrary loan should be increased.

a. Moving library users to the library materials should be considered.

b. Sufficient staff should be employed to maintain good turnaround time, particularly in borrowing.

c. No new programs should be contemplated without making certain that there is provision for sufficient staff.

d. Bibliographic instruction should be expanded.

1) Instruction on how to use the card catalog and the Catalog of Serials should be increased, especially for graduate students. (645 interlibrary loan requests were found on the shelves of the University Libraries in 1981-82).

2) Work should be continued with library staff and library users on the rudiments of filling out an interlibrary loan form.

Colorado Technical Reference Center

Description

All interlibrary loan requests from profit-making organizations are processed by the Colorado Technical Reference Center (CTRC) rather than by the Interlibrary Loan Service. CTRC is an information service designed

to provide people in business, industry, and government with answers to questions as quickly as possible. Among the services offered are computer literature searches, research, current awareness bulletins, and interlibrary loans. Approximately 3,000 interlibrary loan requests are handled each year. Unlike the Interlibrary Loan Service, CTRC charges fees for each of its services. Housing, full use of the collections, and services such as circulation are provided to CTRC by the University Libraries. CTRC is, however, part of the University-Industry Relations department and does not report to the Director of Libraries. The fees charged for the services generally do not completely cover the cost of operation, so University-Industry Relations makes up the difference when necessary.

Evaluation

CTRC provides a prompt information service to those who are most able to pay for it, thus relieving library staff of dealing with such requests. Without CTRC, the workload of reference librarians and interlibrary loan personnel would increase while some of the services would no longer be offered. Some costs are higher for CTRC, such as the courier and OnTyme-II, because it is a separate entity and not a part of the University Libraries. Though cooperation certainly exists, it is sometimes difficult for the staffs to share expertise and work out relationships. CTRC staff, being neither library faculty nor library staff, sometimes finds it hard to keep up with developments in the University Libraries.

Recommendation

The Colorado Technical Reference Center (CTRC) should continue but it should become part of the University Libraries so that the most efficient use of resources can be made. Money should be assigned annually from

the University of Colorado funds to the University Libraries to partially subsidize the services of CTRC to those in Colorado business and industry.

Reciprocal Borrowing

Description

A valid identification for any state institution of higher education allows its holder to check out circulating library materials at any other state institution of higher education. Although reciprocal borrowing aggreements have not been fully formalized, the home institution of the borrower is generally considered to be responsible for restitution or payment for loss. Someone holding a Boulder Public Library card may check out circulating library materials at any other public library in the Central Colorado Library System with the exception, at present, of Denver Public Library. A statewide borrower's card has been discussed, but this does not seem to be a priority concern at this time. Norlin circulation issued approximately 370 cards to reciprocal borrowing library users during 1981-82 at an approximate cost of $440 for processing the cards. Recovering lost materials, or payment for them, has not been a problem in recent years.

Evaluation

Students attending Colorado institutions of higher education are particularly pleased to be able to check out materials at another library. The cost of a circulation transaction is less than the cost of an interlibrary borrowing transaction according to David Weber who estimated the former at 10¢ and the later at $4.00 to $9.00 in 1976.[1] The close proximity of most of the CARL libraries makes this an attrac-

1. David C. Weber, "A Century of Cooperative Programs Among Academic Libraries," College & Research Libraries 37 (May 1976): 217.

tive way to get library materials to the people who need them.

Recommendation

There should be increased publicity about reciprocal borrowing for UCB people. Reciprocal borrowing must be accommodated by the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries' Dataphase circulation system.

Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries

Description

Strong ties are fostered among these libraries. The interlibrary loan agreements provide for 24-hour turnaround time for requests and the provision of 30 pages of free photocopy per bibliographic citation. Passes can be obtained for Denver Public Library without payment of the daily fee which is now charged. Interlibrary loan requests can be speeded to each other by means of the OnTyme-II electronic mail system or the OCLC interlibrary loan subsystem. Document delivery is accomplished by couriers. Work is moving forward on interaction for interlibrary loan requests with the CARL public access catalog and the DataPhase circulation system. A CARL Interlibrary Loan Committee addresses these topics.

Evaluation

Some valuable library materials are borrowed from CARL libraries although UCB remains a net lender in terms of loans and in terms of the provision of photocopy for non-circulating material. Electronic transmission for requests and improved courier structure should provide faster interlibrary loan service in the near future. The photocopy agreement saves billing and depositing of checks. The 24-hour turnaround time is not always observed by CARL members. CARL committees provide a structure where planning for the future can take place.

Recommendations

1. It is imperative to continue active participation on the Colorado

Alliance of Research Libraries' (CARL) committees because of the importance of contributing to developing systems.

2. There should be timely notification sent to all UCB staff concerning CARL activities.
3. Staffing should be improved at the other CARL libraries, where necessary, to achieve the 24-hour turnaround time for interlibrary loan requests.
4. Electronic document delivery should be studied as a possibility for CARL in the future.

Colorado State Library

Description

The Colorado State Library, which is funded by the Colorado State Legislature, administers some programs which have an impact on UCB. The Payment for Lending program, which provides partial reimbursement for net loans, is one such program. Another is the funding of the seven regional library service systems which geographically take in all of Colorado and nearly all the publicly funded libraries be they academic, public, school, or special. UCB belongs to the Central Colorado Library System. Membership for Colorado libraries in the Bibliographical Center for Research is funded by the Colorado State Library. Texas Instruments 700-series terminals have been provided to the regional library service systems and UCB for communication and data base searching. Apple II microcomputers will soon be provided to replace the terminals. UCB serving as an academic resource center has been proposed in the Colorado State Library budget a number of years without winning approval from the legislature. The Federal Library Services and Construction Act money, administered by the Colorado State Library has been used for a variety of projects, among them the Colorado Union Catalog and the CARL online public

access catalog.

As part of the resource-sharing program sponsored by the Colorado State Library, a Colorado Resource Center (CRC) has been funded by the Colorado Legislature. The CRC is the largest public library in Colorado, Denver Public Library. The CRC in the past has answered reference questions and allowed walk-in use of the collection by people not residing in the City and County of Denver. The CRC has been the back-up for interlibrary loan in the state, particularly for public libraries. With insufficient funding to continue these services, the Denver Public Library has closed its doors to free access by non-Denver residents and has refused them reference service by telephone as well. The money which has been appropriated continues to pay for the CRC as a back-up interlibrary loan service to libraries throughout the state. Discontinuance of even the present level of funding would have an impact on lending at UCB.

Evaluation

Reimbursement for lending is not adequate to cover the cost of the service to Colorado libraries. Academic Resource Center functions, such as circulation to non-university library users, walk-in use of the collection, answering of reference questions for non-university library users, and the filling of subject requests by interlibrary loan (not now done), have never been funded at all. The regional library service systems need greater funding to accomplish meaningful cooperative programs, though the procedures for interlibrary loan have prevented inappropriate use of UCB. The Texas Instruments terminal has been used for transmitting requests to libraries other than those in Colorado, which has benefitted UCB. The Apple II microcomputers should prove even more beneficial. At least some LSCA money has gone into resource sharing activities.

Recommendations

1. The Payment for Lending program should provide an adequate cost recovery for gross interlibrary loans to Colorado libraries.

2. The Academic Resource Center should be funded so that better use can be made of library materials purchased by Colorado tax money.

Bibliographical Center for Research

Description

The Bibliographical Center for Research (BCR) is a non-profit, multi-state library services cooperative involving the libraries in the states of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. BCR serves as the broker for OCLC service, bibliographical data base services, and OnTyme-II, an electronic mail system. BCR began as a provider of interlibrary loan locations and referrals, but the cost of maintaining the Regional Union Catalog (no longer used) and the advent of online cataloging systems caused these services to be abandoned. Interlibrary loan activities consist today of fostering a regional interlibrary loan code and arranging document delivery through the Wisconsin Interlibrary Service (WILS). BCR sees as part of its mission the providing of training with workshops being offered on such subjects as bibliographic data base searching, the use of microcomputers in libraries, and cataloging on OCLC. Action for Libraries, published by BCR, keeps the library community informed of developments related to the various services and regional news. The Colorado State Library pays a $10,000 annual membership fee for all libraries in Colorado. Services are billed with a savings offered for pre-payment. Training is generally done on a cost recovery basis. BCR is governed by a Board of Trustees composed of the state librarians and other librarians appointed by the Board to represent the different types of libraries.

Evaluation

The consolidation of bills and savings earned with pre-payments

are valuable as well as the documentation and information provided about the various systems. The training offered is generally well thought out and effective. Some economies are made because of the size of the organization, such as in maintenance contracts. BCR is not without the financial problems which beset such organizations, and the libraries which use the services strongly feel that they are not well represented on the Board of Trustees. There is no election of Board members nor any provision for special representation for "heavy" users.

Recommendations

1. Support should be given to change the Bibliographical Center for Research (BCR) Board of Trustees to direct representation from members who use BCR.
2. Full use should be made of training opportunities.

Mid-America State Universities Association

Description

The Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA) is composed of Colorado State University, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Oklahoma State University, the University of Colorado, Boulder, the University of Kansas, the University of Missouri, the University of Nebraska, and the University of Oklahoma. The libraries agreed to provide each other with 30 pages of free photocopy per bibliographic citation and to charge 10¢ per page for articles 31 pages or more. Other forms of reprography are not covered by the agreement. UCB received 1,430 pages and supplied 2,577 in 1980-81. The library directors meet once each year to discuss mutual concerns.

Evaluation

Avoidance of billing and depositing checks are the benefits of the agreement. Iowa State University, the largest supplier to other libraries,

now charges at the end of the fiscal year for net pages. UCB will have to weigh the cost of billing and depositing checks against the large number of pages provided to others. A general willingness to help each other with all interlibrary loans has resulted from the photocopy agreement and high level of activity among the libraries.

Recommendations

1. The Mid-America State Universities Association libraries' photocopy agreement should be continued as long as it is sufficiently beneficial to UCB.
2. The possibility of lending certain non-circulating materials between MASUA members by United Parcel Service should be explored.

Regional Medical Library Program

Description

The Regional Medical Library (RML) program, established by the National Library of Medicine in the 1960s, plays a vital role in providing information services to health professionals. The RML program is a national network of 11 regional libraries, more than 100 resource libraries, and approximately 3,000 basic unit libraries coordinated by the National Library of Medicine. Each of the Regional Medical Libraries coordinates information delivery services within its own region and cooperates with libraries throughout the network to provide nearly 2 million interlibrary loans annually. UCB is in the Mid-Continental Region, and the entry point to the hierarchical network is the University of Colorado Health Sciences Library, located in Denver. The regions will be reorganized as of November 1, 1982. At that time the states included will be Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah, and Wyoming. In 1980-81, 602 requests were filled by the Health Sciences Library. Other requests were filled by medical libraries in the region

and the National Library of Medicine.

For many years requests were transmitted by teletype, but this year a special electronic system, OCTANET, was set in motion to speed requests to resource libraries. UCB began using the system in September 1982, and already, the turnaround time for interlibrary loans has vastly improved. At present, OCTANET is being funded by the National Library of Medicine.

Photocopy is provided free by the Health Sciences Library because it and UCB are both part of the University of Colorado. Requests being filled by the Mid-Continental Regional Medical Libraries cost $4.50 per transaction which is passed on to the library user. The National Library of Medicine supplies free photocopy, but requests cannot be sent to it until the libraries in the region are exhausted.

Evaluation

The demand for medical interlibrary loans at UCB is substantial. The turnaround time of 6.7 days with the Health Sciences Library in Denver is too long for students and faculty. The OCTANET electronic transmission system and the revised courier routes recommended in the Central Colorado Library System courier study should make a marked improvement in the turnaround time. The hierarchical structure of the Regional Medical Library program is very difficult at times because each level must be applied to before progressing to the next level, even though it is known that the item exists only at the National Library of Medicine, for example.

Recommendations

1. OCTANET should continue to be used to speed requests to the Health Sciences Library and to other medical libraries.
2. The proposed courier route which places the Health Sciences Library and UCB on the same route should be supported.
3. The possibility of transporting library users to the Health Sciences

Library should be explored.

Center for Research Libraries

Description

Any material owned by the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) may be borrowed by a member library for research use on the same basis as if it were the library's own material. The material may be kept for as long as needed. Requests are sent to CRL in Chicago via the Tymshare computer network, and material is delivered by United Parcel Service. Focus, CRL's newsletter, is distributed to the members to keep everyone abreast of purchases and developments.

Lending journals from their own collection or supplying photocopy of journal articles from England is an important service offered by CRL. Any journal article published since 1970 in the fields of social science, science, and technology (but not human medicine) can be requested. If CRL does not have the journal, photocopy of the article is supplied by the British Library Lending Division (BLLD). In 1980-81, BLLD filled 695 such requests for UCB. Since July 1, 1982, a $5.00 transaction fee has been assessed for each BLLD request. UCB decided to split the cost of the transaction with the library user so that each pays $2.50. Since there are some less expensive libraries in the United States where the more common items can be requested, UCB's use of this convenient service will be greatly reduced in 1982-83.

Funding for CRL has come from foundations and membership fees. Foundation money helped CRL to get started and to do some special projects. The annual membership fee charged each institution is based on a formula. UCB's fee for 1982-83 is $14,524. The money goes for new purchases and to run the lending operation. A special assessment has been made for the new building which was occupied in the fall of 1982.

Evaluation

The Center for Research Libraries has in its collections a rich array of research materials which UCB could never hope to duplicate. Though use of CRL is not enormous, the access to such important materials is of great importance to the researchers on the campus. For example, one economics class used as research material CRL's development plans for a number of foreign countries.

The difficulties lie in the areas of cost and publicity. The amount paid for membership is sizable until it is compared to the cost of adding significant research materials to UCB's own collection. Remembering to use CRL is sometimes difficult. To receive the full value from a membership, a conscious effort must be made on the part of library personnel to direct faculty and students to use CRL's resources.

Recommendations

1. Membership in the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) should be retained in order to have a wide variety of expensive research materials not owned by UCB available to the University community.
2. Publicity about CRL should be given higher priority.
3. Using CRL should be stressed when bibliographic instruction is given.

Online Computer Library Center (OCLC)

Description

In addition to using the cataloging subsystem for current cataloging and retrospective conversion, the OCLC interlibrary loan subsystem, used by UCB, serves the needs of both interlibrary borrowing and lending. The interlibrary loan subsystem is a very sophisticated one, with many steps needed to keep track of an interlibrary loan transaction. Verification of bibliographic information and location of libraries holding the material using OCLC have reduced the time needed to get a borrowing request ready

for transmission. Sending the request electronically on OCLC rushes the request to the lending library in seconds. Some 3,858 requests were sent by this means in 1980-81, costing $4,117. Requests to borrow materials from UCB have also come by this method, 3,278 being received in 1980-81. The lending requests must be responded tc within four days, or the records move on to another potential lending library.

The Interlibrary Loan Service has one terminal assigned to it, but the terminal is located some distance from the office in a room adjacent to the Cataloging Department. Bibliographic verification is often done by the Reference staff for the library user on the terminal located in the Reference office.

Evaluation

Though some interlibrary borrowing requests still require manual searching, the only way UCB has been able to keep up at all with the increasing workload has been by searching the OCLC online union catalog. The electronic transmission of the request has a number of advantages such as accuracy and the ability to go to five libraries, one after the other, without having to put the information into the system again. Library materials have arrived from the lender more promptly, too.

The disadvantages of using OCLC arise from the additional training required to use the system and the fact that certain operations in lending take more time than they do manually. Having only four days to supply a request is not enough time in some instances. Despite any difficulties, the entire interlibrary loan staff would be irate if the OCLC interlibrary loan subsystem were not available for use.

Recommendation

The OCLC terminal assigned to Interlibrary Loan should be installed in the Interlibrary Loan Office as soon as possible to prevent wasted time

trekking back to Cataloging and to give better service to the library user.

Library of Congress

Description

The Library of Congress is the capstone to resource sharing in the United States. The immense collections of the Library of Congress can be drawn upon as a last resort for extremely elusive materials. Extensive photocopying facilities exist for copying non-circulating materials. The expertise of the Loan Division staff can be drawn upon for helping to locate library materials not readily found in the United States.

Evaluation

The Library of Congress loans materials without charge which is most helpful when so many large research libraries charge from $5.00 to $12.00 to lend a book.

Recommendation

UCB should continue its strong ties with the Library of Congress Loan Division.

RESOURCE SHARING: DOCUMENT DELIVERY

Description

Timely document delivery is perceived by both the Task Force and the Director of Libraries as being of the utmost importance to resource sharing. Currently, document delivery of interlibrary loan materials is accomplished in three ways: courier, U.S. Postal Service, and United Parcel Service.

The courier serving UCB is sponsored by the Central Colorado Library System (CCLS) of which UCB is a member. A daily delivery is made to all members of the System and a few additional libraries which contract for the service. There are four different courier routes within CCLS. Loans, returns, and communications are carried by the courier. UCB ships between 5,000 and 7,000 pieces each year. All of the CARL libraries and the Health Sciences Library are served by a courier. Colorado State University and the University of Northern Colorado are served by the High Plains Library System courier, and the two couriers meet in Longmont to exchange materials. The University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, is served by the Plains and Peaks Library System courier which meets the CCLS one at the Douglas County Public Library. Largely funded out of state money, a small fee is charged each library for the service it receives. This fee is based upon the number of transactions. UCB paid $735 for this service in 1981-82.

A study of the courier system has just been completed for CCLS. Among the many recommendations is one that would put all the CCLS-CARL libraries and the Health Sciences Library on one route. It appears that this will be done in the near future.

The U.S. Postal Service must be used for many interlibrary loans. The paper work is done by interlibrary loan while the mail room wraps and ships the item. The mail room also unwraps returned materials.

The United Parcel Service is used to send materials which must be insured for safety. The cost is somewhat higher than the U.S. Postal Service for insured materials, but the convenience of a daily pick-up and automatic insurance for $100 for each item is worth it.

Evaluation

The daily courier service is highly beneficial to library users because it moves materials among libraries quickly and allows UCB to lend without wrapping, mailing, and paying for postage. The courier is dependable and safe. Transaction time can be calculated exactly when necessary. The system is an excellent way to transport purchases made cooperatively. The new route which will serve the libraries most important to UCB should improve document delivery time.

The U.S. Postal Service has deteriorated in the past ten years. What used to be an adequate service is now troublesome. Postal rates have risen, delivery time has slowed, and damage to materials has increased.

The United Parcel Service is safer than mail and more convenient to use, but the cost of using it for all but courier requests is prohibitive.

Use of the computerized communication systems for transmitting requests (see RESOURCE SHARING: COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS) has contributed to improved document delivery time and decreased postage costs. Despite all efforts, library users continue to want materials "now" instead of waiting days or months for them to appear.

Recommendations

1. The Central Colorado Library System courier must be supported as vital to resource sharing and cooperative document delivery for Colorado and UCB.
2. Improvements in the courier system to benefit the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) should be encouraged.

3. New technology should be explored for the possibility of improving document delivery to CARL libraries.

THE NATIONAL SCENE AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

Resource sharing is a way of library life and appears to be firmly ensconced at the University of Colorado, Boulder. One might assume that it would progress along in an orderly fashion without much turmoil, but such is not the case. While the principles of sharing resources fluctuate little with the times, the need to do so and the accomplishment of it seem to be in a constant state of change. One cannot sit complacently but instead must keep an eye on what is happening on the national scene and elsewhere.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL), of which UCB is a member, is a planning and policy group which has a certain amount of influence on resource sharing. Accomplishments have included fostering such programs as Dissertation Abstracts, the Farmington Plan, Title II-C of the Higher Education Act, the publication of the Library of Congress catalogs, and the development of the MARC format. A variety of ARL publications bring current information to UCB about activities and developments at the national level. A valuable statistical compilation is published annually. The Director of Libraries takes an active part in Association affairs. The membership fee for 1982 is $13,300.

Networks abound in the United States and come in all sizes and shapes. Perhaps the most important are the "computer utilities" OCLC, the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), the Washington Library Network (WLN), and the University of Toronto Library Automation Systems (UTLAS). These networks all provide online library systems which include union catalogs and, in most cases, interlibrary loan capabilities. Their service, pricing, and development will assuredly have an effect on resource sharing.

The Council on Library Resources is a fund-granting agency based in Washington, D.C. whose purpose is to aid in the solution of library problems. A recent project of the Council, the Linked Systems Project, involves the

Research Libraries Group, the Library of Congress, and the Washington Library Network in the development of a standardized telecommunications link between the computer systems of all three. OCLC has expressed a willingness to provide review, recommendations and technical consultation in the design of telecommunications protocol. Work will be done with the appropriate American National Standards Institute Committee so that the "Standard Network Intercconnection" might be adopted as a national standard for computer-to-computer interchange of information. The work of these groups could certainly have an impact on all resource sharing activities.

Closer to home is the IRVING project. Funded by money from the Library Services and Construction Act, the purpose of the project is to provide access to other host computers on a network of circulation systems from different manufacturers. The ability to find out what another library owns, to facilitate reciprocal borrowing, and to enhance interlibrary loan are included in the plans for the project. Among the participants, Aurora, Boulder, Denver, and Jefferson County Public Libraries, are two DataPhase circulation systems, a CLSI system, and a local system. The design phase of the project is expected to be completed by the end of October 1982. The purchase of equipment and implementation will probably take two years. There are some similarities between the IRVING project and the Linked Systems Project mentioned above.

Another nearby project worth watching is managed by the Pikes Peak Library District (PPLD), of "Maggie's Place" fame. PPLD has a local system for circulation, catalogs, patron access, acquisitions, community file, and ride sharing. The new project will allow PPLD, the U.S. Air Force Academy Library, and the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, online access to the catalogs of all three. An electronic mail application for interlibrary loan may be added. This is another project funded out of Library

Services and Construction Act money.

The discussion continues about a national library network ranging from, "We already have an informal one and the rest will evolve," to "There must be funding and governance for a real national entity to coordinate library network matters." With or without a national network, agencies will be drawing new lines for resource sharing in the future. The role of the Center for Research Libraries is changing as it works to define new acquisition and service policies for its members. The Library of Congress, which after all must serve Congress, strugg'es to gain sufficient appropriations to continue a national role. The work of its Network Advisory Committee is important for the libraries in the country. State library agencies are feeling the impact of reduced budgets and dwindling Federal Library Services and Construction Act money at the same time there is demand for new services. Multi-type library cooperatives continue to strive for programs they can do best. Individual libraries can no longer afford to be magnanimous but must ask themselves, "What is in it for us?" New groups have sprung up as forums for discussion of policies and procedures such as the DataPhase Users Group and the OCLC Interlibrary Loan Advisory Committee. While on the international scene, the Universal Bibliographic Control and the Universal Availability of Publications come in for much discussion.

The copyright law comes up for the fifth-year review in 1983. The publishers seem to want changes which will benefit them, and the librarians want to live with the law the way it is. New legislation on copyright could have profound repercussions in the library world.

Surrounding the political and economic aspects of resource sharing is rapidly developing technology. Electronic publishing, satellite to home broadcasts, microcomputers, optical disk storage, and a multitude of

other developments will surely change the way in which information is sought, discovered, and shared.

> Major problems we still face are less technical than people oriented. We must consider how we preserve and make existing collections accessible, how we can either overcome user preferences, or better, how we can adapt the technology to more effectively meet user needs and preferences. Libraries have a choice of many roles, as do publishers, printers and information services. All can try to retain traditional roles, or they can work together seeking new patterns of relationships and activities. None will have a monopoly on all the information needed by users. The limits are not the technology, but how we use it.[1]

1. M.E.L. Jacob, "Document Delivery Technology; A Brief State of the Art Review," Mimeographed (n.p., 1982), pp. 7-8.

CONCLUSION

While collecting and sifting through the information on resource sharing at the University Libraries, University of Colorado, Boulder, and making suitable recommendations, a number of important points became evident:

1. The rate of change in the practice of resource sharing is dramatic.
2. UCB is heavily involved in resource sharing and all signs point toward continued administrative commitment and support.
3. The library user could benefit from improvements in resource sharing services.
4. Document delivery, a nation-wide problem, remains of concern.
5. The Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries' projects and OCLC emerge as the most important programs to support and use.
6. New activities should be approved after careful consideration. Long range planning, when possible, would be more beneficial than reaction to developments on a day to day basis.
7. Many organizations and projects must be carefully monitored in order to keep up with developments. Participation, where possible, is vital.

In conclusion, one cannot help wondering if all the holes in the dike are stopped and what would happen if a tidal wave occurred.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Appendix G: Interlibrary Loan Service." In University of Colorado, Boulder. University Libraries. "Information Service Policy Manual." Mimeographed. Boulder, CO, 1982.

Avram, Henriette D. "Library Networking in the United States, 1980." Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information 26th (1981): 46-51.

Battin, Patricia. "Libraries, Computers, and Scholarship." Wilson Library Bulletin 56 (April 1982): 580-83.

Boraiko, Allen A. "Electronic Mini-Marvel That is Changing Your Life: The Chip." National Geographic 162 (October 1982): 421-57.

Boss, Richard W. "Resource Sharing: The Next Challenge." Mimeographed. n.p., 1981.

"Chapter X: Review and Analysis of Resource Sharing Activities." In Gardner, Jeffrey G. and Webster, Duane E., The Collection Analysis Project: An Assisted Self-Study Manual. Mimeographed. Washington, D.C.: Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries, 1980.

"Checklist of Questions to be Considered on Entering into or Re-Evaluating Resource-Sharing Agreements." In Task Force on Resource Sharing Activities, "Report," pp. 41-42. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1978.

Collection Analysis Project Study Team. "Collection Analysis Project Interim Report." Mimeographed. Boulder, CO: University Libraries, University of Colorado, n.d.

Colorado Academic Library Master Plan. n.p.: Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 1982.

"A Comparison of OCLC, RLG/RLIN, and WLN." Journal of Library Automation 14 (September 1981): 216-30.

Conference on Resource Sharing in Libraries, University of Pittsburgh, 1976. Library Resource Sharing, by Allen Kent and Thomas Galvin. Books in Library and Information Science, vol. 21. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1977.

Crooks, Susan, H. "Libraries in the Year 2000; Prepared ... for the Library of Congress, Network Advisory Committee." Mimeographed. n.p.: Arthur D. Little, 1982.

Dataflow Systems, Inc. A Glossary for Library Networking. Washington, D.C.: Network Development Office, Library of Congress, 1978.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Computer Network Systems: The Impact of Technology on Cooperative Interlending in the USA." Interlending Review 9 (April 1981): 39-43.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Copyright, Resource Sharing, and Hard Times: A View from the Field." American Libraries 8 (September 1977): 430-35.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Libraries and Networks in Transition: Problems and Prospects for the 1980's." Library Journal 106 (May 15, 1981): 1045-49.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Libraries, Technology, and the Information Marketplace." Library Journal 107 (June 1, 1982): 1045-54.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Research Libraries Enter the Information Age." Library Journal 104 (November 15, 1979): 2405-10.

De Gennaro, Richard. "Resource Sharing in a Network Environment." Library Journal 105 (February 1, 1980): 353-55.

Dickson, Stephen P. Central Colorado Library System Courier System Study: Final Report. Boulder, CO, 1982.

Evans, Glyn T. "Library Networking." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 16 (1981): 211-45.

Harjee, Nimira. "Interlibrary Loan is an Integrated Environment." Special Libraries 73 (January 1982): 1-5.

Jacob, M.E.L. "Document Delivery Technology: A Brief State-of-the-Art Review." Mimeographed. n.p., 1982.

Jones, C. Lee. "Linking Bibliographic Data Bases: A Discussion of the Battelle Technical Report." Mimeographed. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, 1980.

Josey, E.J. New Dimensions for Academic Library Service. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1975.

Kronick, David A. "Goodbye to Farewells: Resource Sharing and Cost Sharing." Journal of Academic Librarianship 8 (July 1982): 132-36.

Lester, Ray. "Interlibrary Borrowing: Costs and Benefits." Interlending Review 9 (January 1981): 9-13.

McDonald, Dennis D. and Bush, Colleen G. Libraries, Publishers and Photocopying: Final Report of Surveys Conducted for the United States Copyright Office. Rockville, MD: King Research, 1982.

Malinconico, S. Michael. "An IFLA Primer." Library Journal 107 (July 1982): 1295-98.

Markuson, Barbara Evans and Blanche Woolls, eds. Networks for Networkers: Critical Issues in Cooperative Library Development. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, 1980.

Martin, Susan K. Library Networks, 1981-82. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1981.

Martin, Susan K. "RLG and OCLC: An Update." Library Issues: Briefings for Faculty and Administrators 2 (May 1982).

Matthews, Joseph R. "Understanding the Utilities: An Introduction to the Birth and Development of the Major Bibliographic Utilities." American Libraries 11 (May 1980): 262-68.

Mehnert, Robert B. "National Library of Medicine." Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information 26th (1981): 93-97.

Moran, Robert F. "Library Cooperation and Change." College and Research Libraries 39 (July 1978): 268-74.

Network Planning Papers, no.1- Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1978-

Nitecki, Danuta A. "Impact of an Online Circulation System on Interlibrary Services." Special Libraries 73 (January 1982): 6-11.

Palmour, Vernon E. and Nancy K. Roderer. "Library Resource Sharing Through Networks." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 13 (1978): 147-77.

Rayman, Ronald. "Interlibrary Loans: A New Burden?" Publishers' Weekly 221 (January 22, 1982): 25-26.

The Role of the Library of Congress in the Evolving National Network. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1978.

Shank, Russell. "IFLA, ALA, & Issues in International Librarianship." Library Journal 107 (July 1982): 1299-1301.

Shurkin, Joel. "The Rise and Fall and Rise of RLG." American Libraries 13 (July/August 1982): 450-55.

Smalley, Donald A., et al. Technical Report on Linking the Bibliographic Utilities: Benefits and Costs. Columbus, OH: Battelle Laboratories, 1980.

Stevens, Norman D. "OCLC and RLG: An Update on Bibliographic Utilities." Library Issues: Briefings for Faculty and Administrators 2 (March 1982).

University of Colorado, Boulder. University Libraries. "Goals." Mimeographed. n.p., 1978.

University of Colorado, Boulder. University Libraries. Inter-Library Cooperation. "Annual Report, 1980-81." Mimeographed. Boulder, CO, n.d.

University of Colorado, Boulder. University Libraries. Office of the Director. "Mission Statement." Administrative Document, no.1. Mimeographed. Boulder, CO, 1982.

Weber, David C. "A Century of Cooperative Programs Among Academic Libraries." College and Research Libraries 37 (May 1976): 205-21.